

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated July 26, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 26, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 12, 17, 18, and 19 have been amended to correct matters of form. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation, "acquiring, or retrieving from storage, seismic data representative of acceleration wavefield." Support for this limitation can be found throughout the specification, including page 15, lines 19-21. Claim 1 has also been amended to include the limitation, "wherein said processing comprises attenuating coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data." Support for this limitation can be found throughout the specification, including page 14, lines 20-26, and page 16, lines 16-18. Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitation, "an input interface for receiving seismic data representative of acceleration wavefield." Support for this limitation can be found throughout the specification, including for example, on page 17, lines 22-26. Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitation, "a data processor and memory comprising program instructions executable by the processor to attenuate coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data." Support for this limitation can be found throughout the specification, including page 14, lines 20-26, page 16, lines 16-18, and page 17, lines 22-26. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments presented herein. The amendments have been made in a good faith effort to advance prosecution on the merits.

Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 5, 10-13, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,883,638(Maxwell). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection.

Maxwell is generally directed to an apparatus for sensing seismic energy which includes a sensor module, a controller, and a radio seismic recorder. The sensor module includes accelerometers. Maxwell describes measuring acceleration using the accelerometers, processing one or more output signals from the accelerometers, and storing the processed signals. Such processing of one or more accelerometer signals involves transferring the signals to a storage media or involves filtering, correction, or transformations of the signals into coordinate systems. See column 10, lines 62-67.

However, Applicants believe that Maxwell does not teach or disclose wherein said processing comprises attenuating coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data, as recited in claim 1; and a data processor and memory comprising program instructions executable by the processor to attenuate coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data, as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 are patentable over Maxwell. Claims 5, 12-13, and 17-19 are also patentable over Maxwell since they depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively. Claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,883,638 (Maxwell) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0129653 (Seth). Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection moot with respect to this claim. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 2 is moot. However, the limitations of claim 2 have been incorporated into claim 1. Applicants respectfully believe that amended claim 1 is patentable over Maxwell in view of Seth.

The Examiner concedes that Maxwell does not specifically disclose attenuating high frequency noise in the seismic data. The Examiner attempts to supplement this missing limitation with Seth. Seth proposes preconditioning of vibration signals by signal amplification combined with low pass and/or high pass filtering. See paragraph

[0019]. More specifically, Seth proposes that filters are selected to reject high frequency non-coherent noise in the vibration signals. See paragraph [0019].

Nevertheless, Seth does not teach or disclose wherein said processing comprises attenuating **coherent** noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data, as recited in amended claim 1 (emphasis added). In contrast, Seth proposes reject high frequency **non-coherent** noise in the vibration signals. Thus, neither Maxwell nor Seth teaches all the limitations of amended claim 1, e.g., wherein said processing comprises attenuating coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Maxwell in view of Seth. Claim 3 is also patentable over Maxwell in view of Seth since it depends from claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,883,638 (Maxwell) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0262645 (Van Barren). Neither Maxwell nor Van Barren teaches or discloses wherein said processing comprises attenuating coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data, as recited in amended claim 1; and a data processor and memory comprising program instructions executable by the processor to attenuate coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data, as recited in amended claim 10. Since claims 7-9 and 14-16 depend from claims 1 and 10, respectively, and since neither Maxwell nor Van Barren, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claims 1 and 10, claims 7-9 and 14-16 are therefore also patentable over Maxwell and Van Barren. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,883,638 (Maxwell) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0129653 (Seth) as applied to claim 2 above and further in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (AAPA) on page 1, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph. Neither Maxwell nor Seth nor AAPA teaches or discloses wherein said processing comprises attenuating coherent noise in a high frequency range in the seismic data, as recited in amended claim 1. Since claim 4 depends from claim 1 and since neither Maxwell nor Seth nor AAPA, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1,

claim 4 is therefore also patentable over Maxwell, Seth and AAPA. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/

Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

PRAMUDJI WENDT & TRAN, LLP

1800 Bering, Suite 540

Houston, Texas 77057

Telephone: (713) 468-4600

Facsimile: (713) 980-9882

Attorney for Assignee